

DPD 1739-61
COPY 2 OF 2

March 14, 1961

*Please see
in
OK
copy*

Dear John:

We are proceeding with design of a reversing processor for duplicate film at an estimated cost of [redacted]

25X1

We would like to submit the following suggestion for your consideration. One Eltron processor for negative film was provided in the initial installation in 1955-1956. This was really two machines operated in series. Since that time, we installed our own machine which provided the principle of the Eltron in one continuous machine and which we termed the Speltron for Special Eltron. Last fall you authorized conversion of one half of the Eltron to another Speltron and work is proceeding. This leaves half of the machine intact which is in effect a complete processor and can be used as such if there is a need for it. However, it is not a duplicate of the Speltron although it can be made to match the sensitometry if sufficient tests are made. We wonder if we will ever need it for production work.

While there would have to be some major revisions, we feel that we could modify it (or more properly redesign and rebuild it) to make a useful reversal processor. At first glance it does not appear that the cost could possibly exceed [redacted] or some [redacted] less than the estimate for a new machine.

25X1

A choice should be made now so that we can get going. Would you care to have us seriously consider cannibalizing this machine or would you prefer that we build an entirely new machine?

ELG/MDG
cc: L.E.W.

E. L. G.

1. c. ii
DPD 1635-61
COPY 1 OF 1

March 9, 1961

Dear Milt:

You may recall the Project Engineering Conference you attended with B.L.E. from our place on 27 February 1961. This letter is in answer to some of those film problems which he brought back with him. As you are due to receive some more material in the near future, I'd like you to know what has been done to try and improve the situation.

- A. Chicken Wire Mottle: Undoubtedly these marks, which were in sync with the flange tie bolts, were the result of tightening down too hard. Along with this is the fact that the flange locating holes and core pins have been a very tight fit. On future shipments, the locating holes will be relieved to fit snug but not tight and the flange tie bolts will be only finger tight. Also, we are investigating the possibility that the tie bolts have a stop to further prevent overambitious tightening of these bolts. This problem should not be present on future rolls; please be sure to check carefully and let us have a sample if you find the trouble has recurred.
- B. Some comment was made about a film deformation which when viewed with reflected light appears to be very minute support streaks. It is extremely doubtful whether we could guarantee support evenness much better than the sample exhibited. Actually, we were unable to measure a thickness difference in that area even though you could just barely see the streaks by eye.
- C. The two continuous scratches on the back of the film strip may have been put on when the film was handled for light striking. This is being investigated. We would not expect this trouble to be present on good material or for that matter on new rolls of "light struck".
- D. Mentioned also was an "edge tacky" condition judged as being caused by flange pressure rather than individual layers sticking to each other. We plan on conducting

-2-

some simple tests of our own to determine what this might be and a way to correct the difficulty. This may have been something which just happened on some of the early rolls and may not recur. We would be interested in results from future rolls.

- E. There was some thought that the aluminized mylar tape splice might be oozing at the edges and cause sticking and poor unwinding. This, of course, is a possibility with any kind of an adhesive splice but might be alleviated somewhat by different tension programming during spool winding. Eventually, but how far in the future is unknown, splices may be of a non-tape variety.
- F. No further comment need be offered on the presence of oil on the tie bolts. Everyone is fully aware that this is inexcusable and we are completely chagrined that our people allowed this to occur.

In summary then, your next rolls of film should look better and specifically:

1. The tie bolts should be finger tight.
2. All parts should be clean.
3. Locating pins should be relieved so that the flanges will come off.

In addition, some of your next rolls will be identified with an "X" and some with a "Y". This denotes a slight difference in the way the final roll was wound, assembled and things of that nature. These things may be so subtle that you can notice no operational advantage or disadvantage over one from another. However, we would like you to observe and record carefully how each roll functions through your system in case one set does, in fact, seem to give you less of a problem. In this way, perhaps there is something we can do which would minimize your difficulties.

There are a few more points on which we would appreciate your comments. These concern the physical unit itself (flanges, cores, tie bolts, shipping containers, etc.). What you have were rather basic units and there may be many things that could be done to improve them if your people are having problems in handling through the system. This would include unpacking, removing flanges, loading into the device and things of that nature. Have you had

-3-

any problems, or can you foresee any difficulties that could be corrected now?

This is rather a long discourse on things in general. However, please feel free to comment on these or other problems so that we can try for an early solution. Of course, we would like explicit information concerning individual rolls and emulsion numbers involved of any material that seems to cause you problems.

JAO/MDG
cc: L.E.W.
J.L.B.

J. A. O.

25X1A
Approved For Release 2002/10/16 : CIA-RDP67B00511R000100140046-6

Approved For Release 2002/10/16 : CIA-RDP67B00511R000100140046-6